

Appl. No. 09/785,864  
Amdt. Dated August 30, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of June 3, 2004

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-11 were pending in this application. No claims have been amended, added, or cancelled. Hence, claims 1-11 remain pending. Reconsideration of the subject application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 5,917,817 to Dunn, *et al.* (hereinafter "Dunn").

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of all claims since the cited reference does not teach all the claim limitations, which it must for a claim to be unpatentable under § 102(b).

Generally, Dunn, the sole cited reference, relates to a system that allows PSTN users to communicate with call management resources, without assistance of telephone company operators, while embodiments of the Applicants' invention relate to the operational aspects of call management. These are distinctly different aspects of telephone systems.

For example, claim 1 recites, "attempting a switch-based call-forward ... detecting a trigger in the SSP ... suspending call processing ... [and] determining whether the call forward should be permitted." Nowhere is this taught in Dunn. In fact, the primary passage of Dunn cited by the examiner (6:14-45) teaches sending a message to a customer's pager to ascertain from the customer whether a weekend call-forwarding pick list should be in effect. This has nothing to do with processing a call to a user and deciding at the SSP how to process the call. These teachings are simply unrelated to the Applicant's claimed invention, and claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons stated above.

Claim 11 includes the limitation, "a trigger associated with said first digit string and activated by a call to the first specific digit string ... said SSP generating a request for a forwarding instruction based upon said trigger." With respect to this limitation, the office action

PATENT

Appl. No. 09/785,864  
Amdt. Dated August 30, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of June 3, 2004


refers generally to the same passage of Dunn references above. There, Dunn teaches that the request for instructions to the user (sent via 2-way pager) is triggered by "the end of the work week." Thus, the request for forwarding instructions is not triggered by "a call to the first specific digit string" as the Applicants claim. Thus, claim 11 is believed to be allowable, at least for this reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



Irvin E. Branch  
Reg. No. 42,358

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 303-571-4000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
IEB:arl  
60250564 v1